REMARKS

Claims 10, 11, 20 are in the case, with claims 18, 23, and 27-30 having been withdrawn without prejudice in response to a previous requirement for restriction.

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner requires a new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) inasmuch as the declaration provided is defective for the address correction of Kerin J. Flannery is not initialed.

Applicants request that this requirement be held in abeyance while a corrected declaration is being obtained. Applicant's attorney has requested that the client obtain a new declaration from the inventor, and will forward it to the Office when available.

35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 10, 11, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner is correct. These claims require extensive work to render them definite. Consequently, applicants have amended these claims to address the concerns of the Examiner and, hopefully, render them definite as required by the statute.

Claims 10, 11, and 20 have been rejected under 35
U.S.C. 103(a) over Gundewar et al. (U.S. Patent No.
6,381,610, hereinafter Gundewar).

Gundewar describes a method of automated project
planning, based on templates (Col. 1, lines 49-55) and
associated work flow (Fig. 4).

On the other hand, applicants' claims are specific to a
general procurement and accounts payable business system and
process, and the way such systems are supported once
deployed. In particular, applicant's claims relate to the
integration of enterprise and service provider teams for
operational ongoing support and quality assessment of the
activities of the service provider team by the enterprise
team.

Applicants have amended claims 10, 11, and 20 to recite
specific structural differences between the claimed
invention and the teachings of Gundewar. These structural
differences include the following (from claim 10, similarly
for claim 20):

> said templates providing data fields for collecting
> support stage data from users of said provider
> terminals during said support stage as said provider
> users operate general procurement and accounts payable
> applications on behalf of said clients;

> said server responsive support stage data input to said

templates at said provider terminals for presenting at user interfaces of enterprise and provider terminals templates for tracking provider team activities with respect to said general procurement and accounts payable application for a client during selected assessment, preparation, development, deployment and support stages, said templates including in a playbook summary view a create a summary task selection button, a create a detailed task button, a folders and views section, a task title display and selection area;

said server, responsive to user selection of said summary task selection button, presenting in said selection area a listing of support stage tasks organized by categories, said categories including project management and transition management categories;

said server, responsive to enterprise user selection of said project management category, presenting in said selection area a listing of support stage tasks for post-implementation quality assurance review and project support review of said provider team activities; and

said server, responsive to provider user selection of said transition management category, presenting in said selection area a listing of support stage tasks for providing communication support, validating transition management support, and performing post implementation survey support.

Support in the specification for these added limitations is found at page 3, lines 5-17, page 4, lines 5-15, page 10, line 19 to page 11, line 3, page 14 lines 10 to page 16, line 18, and so forth.

While applicants have amended these claims to recite the above structural differences with respect to Gundewar, they traverse the suggestion of the Examiner that Gundewar discloses a system for enterprise team members to monitor and assure quality of services provided by a third party service provider.

The Examiner cites Gundewar (col. 3, lines 16-17, col. 4, lines 15-51, and col. 6, lines 60-64), and characterizes these as teaching:

"Users in charge of completing or planning project planning tasks can access the necessary templates that guide them through company or industry standards 'without requiring the user to be familiar with such standards'..."

So far, correct.

"...thereby implying that a third party (i.e., someone external to each user) programs the templates in light of company or industry standards.) [Office Action, page 8.]

Applicants traverse, to the extent that the Examiner is here suggesting that the implied third party is applicants "third party service provider". A third party service

provider in applicant's invention is one who, as the claims
state, manage "...said resulting general procurement and
accounts payable application for a selected customer of said
enterprise." Further, as is specific in claims 11 and 20,
it is the enterprise team that "programs the templates",
that is, creates the tasks that are to be used by the
provider team in managing the application, and then uses
data input by the service provider to assess the quality of
the services provided to the customers of the enterprise by
the service provider. This is not taught by Gundewar.

Applicants urge that amended claims 10, 11, and 20 be
allowed.

Correspondence Address

The address to which the Office Action was directed is
not correct. Hence, the Office Action was returned by the
Post Office as undeliverable and applicant's attorney became
aware of it when accessing PAIR three days ago. Applicant
submitted a change of correspondence address to the Office
over a year ago, and again this week, specifying as the
correct address as the address set forth below.

Conclusion

Applicant request that the above amendment be entered
and the case passed to issue with claims 10, 11, and 20.

The Application is believed to be in condition for

allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

R. F. BARNARD, ET AL.

By

Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 5 Nov 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381

Phone: (276) 238-1972